

REMARKS

Independent Claims 27, 44, and 45 were rejected based on U.S. Patent No. 5,901,209 to Tannenbaum et al. As noted by the Examiner, the earliest effective filing date of Tannenbaum et al. is *after* the earliest effective filing date of the present application. Accordingly, Tannenbaum et al. does not qualify as prior art to the present application. However, the Examiner stated that certain claim elements are not supported in the parent application of the present application and, accordingly, Tannenbaum et al. can be used as prior art. Applicants respectfully disagree.

In its previous Amendment, Applicants noted that the criticized claim elements are supported in Applicants' specification at, *inter alia*, page 7, lines 11-13 and page 10, lines 19-24. In the November 10, 2003 Office Action, the Examiner stated that these passages do not support the criticized claim elements. While Applicants disagree with this conclusion, to expedite the prosecution of this application, Applicants have amended the criticized claim elements to contain the exact language that was present in the specification filed before the earliest effective filing date of Tannenbaum et al. Specifically, independent Claim 27 now recites "passing" modified calling party identification number to a called party. (The other independent claims contain similar elements.) This language can be found at page 10, lines 19-24 (emphasis added):

In forming the response, the SCP honors a privacy indicator for the calling party. Hence, if the user dials a privacy access code (such as "*67"), the call is anonymous. Further, if a user has per-line blocking, the blocking is honored by the SCP. Consequently, the service restricts the ***passing of the calling party identification*** parameter for both per-call and per-line privacy indicators.

This passage teaches that a calling party identification presentation parameter (or number) is passed to the called party unless a privacy indictor is used to restrict the passing of the calling party identification parameter (dependent Claims 35, 51, and 68-71 related to the privacy indicator feature). The calling party identification parameter referred to here has been modified

to an identification number of a group associated with the calling party. Accordingly, passing the calling party identification presentation parameter provides the modified calling party identification number to the called party.

Other portions of the specification that support this element are found in Tables I and II and the following passages:

Page 2, lines 32-35: "Another object of the present invention is to provide a telecommunication service in which members of a group can selectively place group-related, direct-dialed calls from home, where per-line and per-call privacy indicators are honored in the group-related calls." *would be for billing purpose*.

Page 5, lines 32-33: "If the first member desires that the call be anonymous, a privacy access code (such as "*67") is dialed prior to dialing the phone number."

Original Claim 7: The system of claim 1 wherein the service switching point receives a privacy access code prior to receiving the dialed number, and wherein the service control point restricts a passing of the calling party identification number to the called party in response thereto."

In summary, the above passages show that the pending claims are supported by Applicants' originally-filed specification. Therefore, the claims are entitled to the parent application's filing date, and, thus, Tannenbaum et al. does not qualify as prior art. Because, as admitted by the Examiner, Shaffer et al. does not teach passing a calling party identification number that has been modified to an identification number of a group associated with the calling party, Shaffer et al. cannot support the rejection of the claims. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections against the claims be withdrawn and that this application

be passed to allowance. If there are any questions concerning this Amendment, the Examiner should contact the undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4719.

Dated: March 8, 2004

Respectfully submitted,


Joseph F. Hetz
Reg. No. 41,070
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER
GILSON & LIONE
P.O. Box 10395
Chicago, Illinois 60610
(312) 321-4719